



Minutes for Meeting July 26, 2006

Date of Meeting: July 26, 2006
Name of Committee: CITY CENTER ADVISORY COMMISSION
Notes taken by: Phil Nachbar, Sean Farrelly
Called to order by: Carl Switzer
Time Started: 6:30
Time Ended: 9:00pm

Members Present: Carolyn Barkley; Gretchen Buehner; Alexander Craghead; Suzanne Gallagher; Alice Ellis Gaut; Lily Lilly; Roger Potthoff; Carl Switzer

Members Absent: Ralph Hughes (Alternate); Judy Munro

Others Present: 2 others, unidentified (arrived late)

Staff Present: Phil Nachbar, Barbara Shields, Sean Farrelly

Agenda Item #1: Approve Minutes

Important Discussion and / Comments: The minutes of June 14 and June 21 were approved. A motion was passed to include the comments of Lisa Olsen as an addendum to the minutes of June 21 for reference. Her comments were incorporated into the minutes.

Agenda Item #2: CCAC By-laws

Important Discussion and/or Comments: The Commission will be providing comments and specific ideas for their by-laws. Phil Nachbar stated that staff would be providing a report and a draft of by-laws (or their contents) to Council for the scheduled Aug 15th workshop. He indicated that he would provide members with a copy of what was provided to Council so they could prepare for the discussion with Council. There would be time to discuss By-laws at the next CCAC meeting on August 9th.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): Council materials to be provided. None.

Agenda Item #3: Developer Letter

Important Discussion and/or Comments: The CCAC decided at an earlier meeting that having a letter signed by the CCAC to be provided at Pre-App meetings to developers with projects in the Downtown could address the concern that new regulations are not yet in place. The letter would provide reference to the Downtown Improvement Plan, and its intent to provide for a quality of development. A draft letter was provided by Roger Pottoff, and discussed by the group.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): Roger will be coming up with a revised draft of it to include the groups' comments for the next meeting.

Agenda Item #4: Land Use / Design Guidelines Program and Schedule

Important Discussion and/or Comments:

At the beginning of the meeting, Phil passed out the draft Streetscape Report for comments from the CCAC. The group was asked to provide comments and return them at the August 9th meeting. Roger Potthoff asked how Streetscape fits into the process, and how the Streetscape recommendations be enforced. Lisa Olson discussed the Streetscape process and how it fit into the big picture. Phil Nachbar explained that the implementation of Streetscape recommendations would occur in two ways: the Downtown Implementation Strategy, which will be adopted by Council, includes a specific action to incorporate the recommendations into the design of Downtown Streets. In addition, the Streetscape Report will be adopted by Council, accepting the recommendations of the report. Streetscape design is not intended for inclusion in any regulations at this point in time.

Sean and Barbara gave an overview of the schedule and program to develop new regulations for Downtown. Sean Farrelly went through a power point presentation and the roles of the different boards involved, Planning Commission and CCAC, was discussed. The Planning Commission will have primary review of the Land Use / Design Guidelines developed for Downtown. The CCAC is developing the initial direction for land use and building design guidelines for Downtown, but are using the Downtown Improvement Plan as a basis. The CCAC has been working with Phil Nachbar on this since the end of June. The resulting report will provide direction to the Long Range Planning Staff, Sean Farrelly, to develop the regulations.

Phil mentioned that the CCAC would get periodic updates and have an opportunity to see if, in fact, their recommendations are being following, and provide input as necessary.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): CCAC to provide comments on the Streetscape final draft at the next August 9th meeting.

Agenda Item #5: Land Use / Design Guidelines—Density, Height, and Parking.
Examples of desired development.

Important Discussion and/or Comments: Phil presented a PowerPoint on various land use/design guideline options and photos of developments that incorporated good design principles.

On Main St, there are ways of keeping the Main St. feel but allowing a variety of styles of buildings that fit together. For residential areas, sustainable design concepts could be built in. residential buildings with courtyard, and pathways could be encouraged near Fanno Creek.

Phil discussed the map with proposed land use zones. There was discussion of whether Center St. had good access to allow for retail. Proposed land uses for Center Street could include a range of uses including mixed use, office, and residential as a part of a mixed use office / retail development. The future of Center Street does not include making it an entryway to Downtown. Single use retail is not a suggested use for the area.

There was a discussion as to whether large big box retail development would detract from the pedestrian focus in the regional retail area. The number of sq. feet of retail could be limited and two-stories and/or mixed use could be required. This will be addressed at the next meeting.

A discussion of parking touched on the desire to limit surface parking and encourage structured parking. In the meantime there could be dedicated on-street parking for businesses with a lot of turnover. A parking management plan will be needed at a later time to consider a plan for structured parking. Parking will be monitored so that a parking study can be done at the appropriate time.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): Staff will address big box retail limitations, and look at how or if larger retail businesses could be incorporated into the north section of Downtown. This will be discussed at the next meeting August 9th. Land uses for Center Street will be proposed. More specific recommendations on parking in the Downtown will be presented and discussed.

Agenda Item #6: Interim Land Use / Urban Creek Corridor Overlay Regulations

Important Discussion and/or Comments: Phil discussed the possibility of creating an interim Urban Creek overlay zone that would restrict new development in the corridor of the proposed Urban Creek. Current uses could continue. This would prevent new development that would preclude the urban creek open space.

There was discussion as to whether an overlay zone would have the same effect as a “taking” or possibly “condemnation” and could be legally challenged.

There was also discussion about what the effect of new regulations might be on small businesses in the Downtown. Carolyn Barkley, the owner of a barber shop in Downtown, questioned whether these regulations might result in existing businesses having to move

because of new development, higher rents. Roger Potthoff discussed this point, saying that the kind of business Carolyn had was just the kind of small business needed in the Downtown, and that the uniqueness of her business had to do more with her than a building.

The core of this discussion has to do with whether the Commission can encourage small businesses to stay in Downtown, and what, if any thing, it could do. Phil Nachbar mentioned that without condemnation, property owners might have more opportunity to band together to, perhaps, create their own development that might provide rental or ownership space for existing businesses. This might be a strategy that the group should look at when considering redevelopment and land assembly, which is part of the work program for the year, but will occur latter in the fiscal year. A comment was made that bringing more people downtown to live will be good for businesses because they will want convenient services.

There was talk about how an overlay zone could cause a backlash among property owners. Outreach by members was needed to communicate with Downtown property owners about the long term benefits of the plan.

There was also talk that there needed to be further refinement of the Urban Creek idea and that conceptual drawings would help sell the idea.

These two points, the need for outreach to property owners, and good visual graphics to explain the concept are important to the implementation of the Urban Creek Corridor.

Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes): Lily made a motion to recommend to Council to direct staff to evaluate the feasibility and need for an Urban Creek Overlay Zone. Gretchen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item #7: Other Business

Important Discussion and/or Comments: None.